

Dear Bruce

I should criticize various things in your last Times article, if you were here to talk it over with me.

If you expected Stanley to do what you criticize him for not doing, you would naturally be disappointed. His merit, and his way, as a lecturer is, to select some good topic or point of view and make a clear exposition of it, - the clearness of which very much depends upon his not scattering himself over too much ground. He naturally kept himself to matters he could handle well, and let alone those upon which - as we very well know - he had nothing in particular to say.

1. "Merest fancies", "useless fabric of a dream" &c -

Why, what made Owen an evolutionist as early as Darwin? And what has made so many

Naturalists (Mivart, & lately Dana, for instance, evolutionists who yet think nothing of Natural Selection. — (Dana, for instance ~~is~~ (entre nous) not yet comprehending it.)

But, to illustrate. You allow that the evolutionary pedigree of the horse is made out, but what had "Natural Selection" to do with making this out?

It would have been all the very same, — both the evidence and the ground of the inference, if Natural Selection had never been propounded. There is no evidence how the forms were related — there is simply the fact of the series of forms — which, with other like evidence — brings conviction to most naturalists that one has somehow come from the other. And this conviction is about as strong to those ^{who do not} ~~not~~ believe "Natural Selection" will explain it,

as those who do.

2. Prof. Geayt you mean. Dana avowedly ~~adps~~ adopts from Geayt.

3. To those who talk or think of necessary evolution, or, like Spencer, deduce it ex necessitate rei, this matter of immense time is very pertinent. I don't think Darwin is bothered by it much. — On my way of thinking, it is no bother at all. — Considering what a deal of time there has been any way.

4. Do you mean "hybrid forms"? I fail to see what hybrid, i.e. mules from the crossing of related species — has to do with it, one way or the other. Nobody (of clear conceptions) supposes new species come from the mixture of other species. That is a way to confuse or blend species, not to originate them.

But there is no "want of hybrids" - there are plenty of them, and they have mixed some few species - (Dogs, for instance); but they play no important part in the matters you are considering.

"Want of connecting forms in living species" - that is to the purpose. Well - as a systematic botanist, I wish there was a want. The connecting forms are my great trouble every day. You would save me an awful deal of trouble, time, & constant uncertainty, if you would cause them to be wanting!

5. So you will not accept the motto "ex uno disce omnes";

If you admit the horse evolution as proved, does not that carry an implication of evolution in other lines, of which similar, but fewer steps are known. Or are all evolutions those of cavalry?